

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10 SAN JOSE DIVISION  
11

12 TIMOTHY GENS,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 VELLO CORPORATION, et al.,

16 Defendants.  
17

Case No.: C 10-3220 PVT

**ORDER THAT CASE BE REASSIGNED TO A  
DISTRICT JUDGE**


18 On October 22, 2010, this court issued an order striking the erroneous “Consent to Proceed  
19 Before a United States Magistrate Judge” that Plaintiff purportedly filed on behalf of Defendant  
20 Vello Corporation (“Vello”), and set a deadline of November 2, 2010 for Defendant Vello to file  
21 either a “Consent to Proceed Before a United States Magistrate Judge,” or else a “Declination to  
22 Proceed Before a United States Magistrate Judge and Request for Reassignment.” As of the date of  
23 this order, Defendant Vello has not filed either form. Therefore,

24 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this case be reassigned to a District Judge for all further  
25 proceedings based on the fact not all parties have consented to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction. This  
26 order is without prejudice to the parties later consenting to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction.

27 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the hearing on Plaintiff’s motion for remand, and the Case  
28 Management Conference are VACATED. Plaintiff must renote his motion on the calendar of the

1 District Judge to whom this case is reassigned. A new Case Management Conference will be also set  
2 on that judge's calendar.

3 Dated: *11/10/10*

4   
5 PATRICIA V. TRUMBULL  
6 United States Magistrate Judge  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28